Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00092 072011Z

70
ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /031 W
---------- 028796
P R 071805Z OCT 74
FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2326
INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 0092

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS TO DOD

E.O. 11652: SGDSI
TAGS: PARM
SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON PRIVATE MEETINGS, OCTOBER 7 (SALT TWO-456)

1. AT TWO AND ONE-HALF HOUR MEETING WITH SEMENOV THIS AFTERNOON, I REVIEWED OUR POSITION IN DETAIL, INCLUDING STATEMENT I WILL MAKE TOMORROW ON CONSTRAINING THE PACE AND MAGNITUDE OF BOTH QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DEVELOPMENTS AND MUTUAL EQUITABLE RESTRAINTS IN MODERNIZATION AND REPLACEMENT, POINTING UP MUTUALITY OF OUR PROPOSALS AND THOSE ASPECTS WHICH SHOULD BE OF PARTICULAR INTERESTS TO SOVIETS.

2. IN RESPONSE TO MY PRESENTATION, SEMENOV SAID HE WOULD HAVE TO "REFLECT" ON MY PRESENTATION, AND SUGGESTED ANOTHER PRIVATE MEETING ON THURSDAY, TO WHICH I AGREED. HE THEN SPOKE TO MIRV'S SAYING SOVIETS AGREED NEW AGREEMENT SHOULD CONTAIN LIMITATIONS ON MIRV'S AND SAID HE WOULD SPEAK TO THIS SUBJECT TOMORROW. HE SAID THAT SOVIETS WOULD PROPOSE THAT "ONLY A CERTAIN PORTION" (PERCENTAGE) OF EACH SIDE'S MISSILE FORCE WOULD BE MIRVED,WITH RELATIVE DIVISION BETWEEN MIRVED ICBMS AND MIRVED SLBMS DETERMINED BY EACH SIDE AT ITS OWN DISCRETION. HE REFUSED ANY CLEAR ANSWER AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE PERCENTAGE FOR EACH SIDE WOULD BE EQUAL, AND IN RESPONSE TO MY PRESSING HIM ENDED BY FINALLY SAYING THAT THEIR PROPOSAL WAS AMBIGUOUS ON THIS POINT AND LEFT THE ISSUE OPEN.
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00092 072011Z

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

3. HE THEN ASKED QUESTION ON OUR MENTION OF "SPECIAL MEASURES" TO VERIFY MIRV DEPLOYMENTS, SAYING THIS WAS VERY "TROUBLESOME" AND IMPLIED WE PROBABLY HAD SOMETHING MORE IN MIND THAN USING NATIONAL

TECHNICAL MEANS. I EXPLAINED THAT WE ONLY HAD IN MIND HOW NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS COULD BE MADE EFFECTIVE IN THIS AREA WHICH PRESENTED DIFFICULTIES AND RPOBLEMS FOR BOTH SIDES.

4. HE THEN RAISED QUESTION ON WHAT WE MEANT BY "TAKING INTO ACCOUNT" THROW-WEIGHT AND WARHEADS IN ESTABLISHING LIMITS ON MIRV LAUNCHERS TO WHICH I NOTED THAT WE WERE NOT SUGGESTING EQUAL LEVELS AND THE POSSIBLE OFFSETS WHEN TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ASYMMETRIES IN

BOTH THROW-WEIGHT AND REENTRY VEHICLES. IN REPLY TO HIS QUESTION I SAID THAT I DID NOT PERCEIVE THIS BEING SUBJECTED TO A MATHE-MATICAL FORMULA BUT RATHER AS AN ELEMENT IN NEGOTIATIONS.

5. IN RESPONSE TO HIS QUESTION ON REDUCTIONS, I SAID THAT WE WERE ON THE ONE HAND NOT THINKING OF PURELY SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS AND ON THE OTHER HAND OF PROPOSING UNREALISTICALLY LOW LEVELS AS A PRO-PAGANDA GESTURE, BUT RATHER SOMETHING REASONABLY IN BETWEEN. I SAID THAT I FELT CONFIDENT THE U.S. WOULD BE PREPARED TO GO JUST AS LOW AS THE
SOVIETS WERE PREPARED TO GO AND, OBVIOUSLY, NO SIDE WAS FORCED TO AGREE TO ANY LEVEL TO WHICH IT DID NOT WISH TO AGREE.

6. IN RESPONSE TO HIS AGAIN RAISING F.B.S., I SAID THAT I AND MY STAFF HAD BEEN STUDYING HIS OCTOBER 4. STATEMENT IN AN ATTEMPT TO ANSWER QUESTIONS AS TO WHETHER THAT STATEMENT CONTAINED ANY IM-PLICATIONS THAT SOVIET SIDE WAS PROPOSING RESOLUTION OF FBS IN 1985 AGREEMENT DIFFERENT FROM THAT WHICH IT HAD PROPOSED FOR A PERMANENT AGREEMENT AND, IF SO, WHAT WAS THE PROPOSAL. I SAID IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF HE COULD POINT TO WHERE THOSE QUESTIONS WERE ANSWERED IN HIS STATEMENT. HE REFUSED TO MAKE ANY SUBSTKNTIVE RESPONSES AND RETORTED WITH QUESTION AS TO WHETHER MY STATEMENT THAT 1985 AGREEMENT GAVE OPPORTUNITY TO PUT ASIDE ISSUES WHICH COULD NOT BE PUT ASIDE IN PERMANENT AGREEMENT REFERRED TO FBS. I SAID I HAD NOTHING TO ADD TO WHAT I HAD SAID. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MILITARY AIRCRAFT, AGREEMENTS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS, NUCLEAR WEAPONS, SALT TWO 456
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 07 OCT 1974
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: elyme
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974SALTT00092
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740284-0172
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741067/aaaaceyd.tel
Line Count: 98
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 2
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: elyme
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 MAY 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03 MAY 2002 by garlanwa>; APPROVED <10 MAR 2003 by elyme>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: COMMENTS ON PRIVATE MEETINGS, OCTOBER 7 (SALT TWO-456)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005